



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,048	11/16/1999	MICHAEL J. CALVILLO	98-1146	5358

24333 7590 01/15/2002

GATEWAY, INC.  
ATTN: KENNETH J. COOL  
610 GATEWAY DRIVE  
MAIL DROP Y-04  
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

ALI, SYED A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/442,048

Applicant(s)

CALVILLO ET AL.

Examiner

Syed A. Ali

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent 5,649,186) in view of Stark (U.S. Patent 5,935,210).

Ferguson rendered obvious independent claims 1 and 16 by the following:

“determining a site home for the network site” at col.4, lines 61-67; col. 5, lines 1-14;

Ferguson does not teach explicitly concerning user request being received for a given site and its home site.

However, Stark does teach of concerning a user request being received for a given site and its home site.

“receiving a request to navigate...of the network site” at col.5, lines 65-67; col.6, lines 1-14;

“wherein a...network site, navigating ...in response to the received request” col.6; lines 24-27;

“whereby information provided by the site home may be communicated to a user” at col. 4, lines 34-67; col. 5, lines 1-27.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to request/receive information from/to a user for a given site for composing

Art Unit: 2177

and mapping a desirable format or structure of the information of the site. This would avoid unnecessary navigation through a maze of hyperlinks of the given site reducing the time to access the desired information. In the process, there is a conveyance of the integrity and the theme of the site, whether the information of the site is objectionable with interest to time.

Starks rendered obvious claims 2 and 17 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

"a site...not found for the network site, communicating to the user that the site...not found" at col. 3, lines 50-60.

Starks rendered obvious claims 3 and 18 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

"...locating the address of the site home...identifying...the site home" at col. 5, lines 1-8.

Starks rendered obvious claims 4, 14, 19 and 29 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

"retrieving a...(HTML)...with the site page" at col. 4, lines 25-67;

"determining if HTML...includes...tag" at col. 1, lines 57-67;

"determining if...includes a characteristic label" at col. 1, lines 57-67;

"determining that the site page is the home site..." at col. 5, line 1-27;

"searching a server serving up the network site..." col. 4, lines 34-65.

Art Unit: 2177

Starks rendered obvious claims 5 and 20 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;  
“wherein... comprises at least one of... html” col. 4, lines 34-65.

Starks rendered obvious claims 6 and 21 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;  
“reading the address of the site page wherein the address comprises... address components ... separator for separating... other components of the address” at col. 5, lines 1-27; col. 6; lines 23-63; cols. 7-8;  
“parsing... of the site page into its ... components wherein one of the... comprises the address of ... site home” at col. 5, lines 1-27; col. 6; lines 23-63; cols. 7-8;

Starks rendered obvious claims 7, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 28 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;  
“wherein the address comprises the... (URL)...” at col. 6, lines 54-56; col. 8, line 15-17.

Ferguson rendered obvious claims 8, 11, 23 and 26 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;  
“wherein the separator comprises at least one of a slash (“/”) and a double slash (“//”)... (URL) of ... leading double slash (“//”) and a trailing slash (“/”) at col. 3, lines 1-10.

Art Unit: 2177

Ferguson rendered obvious claims 9 and 24 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

“reading the address of the site page... comprises address components...” at col. 3, lines 1-24;

“parsing... site page into the one or more components” at cols. 2-4;

“comparing each of the parsed... components to an index... stored site home address...” at cols. 3-5.

Ferguson rendered obvious claims 12 and 27 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

“interrogating the site map... of the site home... if a site map is detected” at col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5.

Ferguson does not teach explicitly of detecting if a site exists.

However, Starks does teach of detecting if “detecting if a site map exists for the network site” (col. 3, lines 54-58; col. 6, lines 23-37; col. 8, lines 28-47; col. 3, lines 45-64).

Ferguson rendered obvious claims 15 and 30 by the same rationale as stated in independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, and;

“...request navigate from a site page to the site home...” at col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5.

Ferguson rendered obvious independent claim 31 by the following:

“a processor for a executing a program of instruction handling system” at col. 6, lines 37-48;

“a memory coupled to the processor...” at col. 6, lines 37-67;

“the program...determine and navigate to a site home of a network site...” at col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5, lines 1-25;

Ferguson does not teach explicitly “a communication device for coupling the information...to an information network”.

However, Starks does teach of “a communication device for coupling the information...to an information network”(col.10).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize such technology that allows information to be coupled with information network. That would be the best medium to navigate a network site. Such communication device would make it possible to access the desired information of the network site resourcefully.

Ferguson rendered obvious claim 32 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

“...comprising a display...capable of displaying graphical user interface...” at col. 1, lines 51-58; col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5, lines 1-25.

Ferguson rendered obvious claim 33 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

Art Unit: 2177

“...locating the address of the site home by identifying...characteristic...to the site home” col. 1, lines 51-58; col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5, lines 1-25.

Starks rendered obvious claim 34 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

“wherein the...(HTML)...associated with the site page” at col. 4, lines 25-67;

Starks rendered obvious claim 35 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

“wherein...comprises at least one of...html” col. 4, lines 34-65.

Ferguson rendered obvious claim 36 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

“...locating a site home...for identifying a site home of the network site” at col.4, lines 61-67; col. 5.

Ferguson rendered obvious claim 37 and 39 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

“...locating...site home...parsed...components...of the site home” at cols. 3-5.

Starks rendered obvious claims 38, 40 and 42 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;



"...comprises a... (URL)" at col. 6, lines 54-56; col.8, line15-17.

Ferguson rendered obvious claim 41 by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 31, and;

"interrogating the site map...of the site home...if a site map is detected" at col.4, lines 61-67; col. 5.

Ferguson does teach explicitly of detecting if a site exists.

However, Starks does teach of detecting if "detecting if a site map exists for the network site" (col. 3, lines 54-58; col. 6, lines 23-37; col. 8, lines 28-47; col. 3, lines 45-64).

### ***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference *indicated as being mailed* on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Questions concerning the merits of this or an earlier Office Action from the examiner should be directed to Syed A. Ali whose voice line is (703) 605-4241 and fax line is (703) 308-5403.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790.

Application/Control Number: 09/442,048  
Art Unit: 2177

Page 9

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Syed Ali  
Patent Examiner  
M-F, 9:00am - 5:30pm

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100